

present blade claims, stands on the threshold of patenting them. Such a result would be directly *contrary* to Rule 658(c) (issues raised and decided in an interference are settled) and is fundamentally unfair to applicant. At a minimum, a further interference should be declared to decide whether Rydell can, in fact, present blade claims and, if so, to determine priority of invention.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons presented herein, the rejections should be withdrawn and applicant's claims held allowable. If blade claims also are deemed allowable to Rydell, no patent should be issued to either party at this time, but instead, an interference should be declared on the blade invention.

Respectfully Submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By: _____

Barbara C. McCurdy

Registration No. 32,120

Date: February 17, 2000

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005
202-408-4000